DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 128 CG 012 386

AUTHOR Signori, Edro I.; And Others
TITLE Attitudes Toward the Aged.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 24p.; Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association on Gerontology (La Cite Hotel, Montreal, Quebec, October 13-16, 1977); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Attitudes; Education; Financial Problems; Gerontology; *Measurement Instruments; *Needs; *Older Adults; Research Projects; *Social Attitudes; *Stereotypes; Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS *Loneliness

ABSTRACT

Research data elicited among subjects aged 14-40, on their attitudes toward the elderly (age 65 and over) indicates that older persons are viewed neutrally on many traits, better than average on some, and stereotypically on others. While they are viewed as weaker, poorer, and less powerful, they are also seen as having greater humanity, experience, sensitivity and persistence than younger persons. Implications of these attitudes toward older persons exist for policy-making in the care of the elderly. The rating instrument and the data analyses are appended. (CKJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
E.I. Signori
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ED153128

CG012386

Attitudes Toward the Aged

Edro I. Signori, Dorcas Susan Butt, and John F. Kozak,
Department of Psychology
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, B. C.

Introduction.

Our last year's report[1]* on a study of attitudes of the elderly towards aging and the aged seemed to give greater support to the contention that the older adult is viewed negatively as an ineffectual, unhappy and lonely person with no specific useful role to play in our present society - than more positively as a useful citizen.

According to one elderly respondent "the elderly are seen as expendable supercargo in which the attitude aggravates as government costs rise".

Other findings from a number of studies conducted elsewhere in N.A. during the 60's and early 70's have also tended to support this negative portrayal of the elderly (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) while several more recent studies contrastedly have reported that a more positive image of the elderly was held by the young than was previously reported (7), (8), (9).

The purpose of the present study was to solicit further information on attitudes toward the aged by B.C. residents in the lower mainland where 2/3 of the population and most of the older citizens live.

The Data:

The data collected are presently limited to the ratings of older people (65 years and over) made by 456 subjects between the ages of 14 and 40, called the 'young' population in this project. The number of respondents involved include a male population of 222 age-matched with a female population of 234. Difficulties encountered in locating sufficient appropriate subjects of a middle-aged population between the ages of 41-64 and a population of older people 65 years and over has delayed the realization of the original aim of this project concerned with comparisons of the stereotypes at the three age levels of respondents. However, while collection of data from the older respondents

---

Presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Association on Gerontology held Oct. 13-16, 1977: La Cité Hotel, Montreal, Quebec.
* see references

continues and will eventually be added to this report, it should be noted that had these data been procurable it is unlikely that the analysis of the data of our first group could have been completed in time for this report, because data collection of this magnitude does in itself consume inordinate amounts of time.

Rating Scale:

The original Rating Form (10) consisted of 67 bipolar seven-point trait scales, whereas the improved Form (appendix 1) used in the present study has 69 scales. Although many of the individual trait scales are the same in both Forms, the improvements made allowed for substituting trait-labels used by the elderly gleaned from our previous study of the elderly (1) for synonymous labels found on the original form; and also for assuring that trait labels with the highest loading on Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (23) might also be included to assure that an appropriate universe of trait labels for describing personality was represented in the Form. Moreover, adjustments of labels were also made to assure and improve, when possible, upon the valid oppositeness of the bipolar labels chosen to represent each trait scale. The judgments of 3 independent evaluators confirmed these improvements. Moreover because all of these suggestions for improvements affected only a small number of items overall, the changes made are deemed not sufficient to disallow making comparisons of data from the present study with that obtained by using the original rating form in earlier studies on groups representing various kinds of social disadvantage, e.g., mental retardates, ex-mental patients, hippies, ex-criminals, negroes, N.A. Indians and women (11).

Thus to recapitulate briefly, the data for analysis include the ratings made on 69 improved bipolar scales by age-matched populations of male and female respondents between the ages of 14-40, with a mean age of 23.74 and an S.D. of 5.26 with only small decimal differences between the male and female groups.

Results:

Although a number of factor analyses (12) were computed involving solutions for 3, 5 and 8 factors for the total group and some for male and female data separately, the computation of 5 factors with a limiting eigen-value of 1 produced the most clearly interpretable factors in these data. The labels tentatively assigned to these factors with factor statistics and variable loadings are shown in Table A.

Table A

Factor #	I	II	III	IV	V
Tentative Name	Conscionable-sociableness	Leadership-fortitude	Social appeal	Dependability	Conservativeness-Radicalness (a bipolar factor)
Eigenvalue	16.29	4.03	2.30	1.54	1.35
% variance	23.61	5.84	3.36	2.38	1.96
cum.prop.var.	.24	.29	.33	.35	.37

Variables and loadings defining each factor

kind, gentle	.61	healthy, strong	.68	delightful, exquisite	.63	reliable, responsible	.56	rigid, stubborn	.54
truthful, honorable	.59	strong, vigorous	.58	enhances, advances	.59	restrained, temperate	.53	intolerant, impatient	.46
well-mannered, lovely people	.58	involved, participating	.57	talented, gifted	.58	co-operative, helpful	.44	suspicious, untrusting	.38
agreeable, understanding	.57	energetic, active	.56	insightful, intuitive	.57	conscientious, scrupulous	.43	frigid, undersexed	.36
mature, adjusted	.56	determined, ambitious	.55	appreciative, sensitive	.56	careful, cautious	.39	gossipy, mouthy	.35
controlled, disciplined	.54	assertive, aggressive	.52	industrious, productive	.51	methodical, efficient	.38	subjective, personal	.33
sacrificing, giving	.52	enthusiastic, zestful	.52	clean, well-groomed	.50	honest, trustworthy	.38	habituated, addicted	.19
possess dignity, self-respect	.47	independent, self-sufficient	.47	humorous, witty	.50	self-depreciating, modest	.36	clannish, narrow-minded	.41
harmless, wholesome	.46	tough-minded, self-reliant	.46	creative, imaginative	.48			conservative, traditional	.49
modesty, humility	.43	contented, happy	.45	intelligent, bright	.46				
sane, sensible	.43	unworried, secure	.45	charming, pleasing	.40				
sociable, friendly	.42	venturesome, uninhibited	.45	idealistic, high-minded	.40				
generous, altruistic	.40	rich, influential	.40	educated, learned	.36				
cheerful, optimistic	.35	trained, skilled	.39	fragrant, aromatic	.36				
serene, relaxed	.33	over-bearing, dominant	.38	quiet, placid	.32				
stable, well-balanced	.33	endurance, persistence	.36	courageous, brave	.31				
		competent, professional	.36	frank, fortright	.29				
		organized, co-ordinated	.35						
		confident, reliant	.34						

Details pertaining to the traits which load on each factor and the means and s.d.'s for the total sample, separately for the female and male samples, are shown in the following five tables for (Factors I, II, III, IV, V).

On a comparison of female and male sample means, on the various traits, these data yeld a Hotelling T^2 value of 96.93 and an Associated F value of 1.194 which is not significant at the .05% level of confidence.

On differences between the mean factor scores of males and females on the five factors only one significant, but small, difference is shown; viz. that for Social Appeal, Factor III, where males seem higher than females; though of little practical consequence.

Factor	I	II	III*	LV	V
males	-.019	-.036	.104	.001	-.057
females	.010	.034	-.099	-.001	.054

* t-value 2.425, $p < .015$

An outstanding feature of the traits covered by the 5 factors is that in the greater majority of them the rating averages are consistently toward the more favorable end of the scale (higher than 4) for both males and females, hence it is fairly concluded that in this sample of younger respondents the impression is that persons 65 years and older are generally thought of as possessing favorable and beneficial human qualities. Moreover, in the few instances where the averages fall below the mid-point value of 4 at the more unfavorable end of the scale, the lower values seem consistent with the traditional stereotype of the older person. Thus, he is more typically rated to be weaker, more delicate and unhealthy and poorer and less powerful, rigid, stubborn, frigid, gossipy and subjectively oriented, but the average ratings on some of these fall by only small decimal amounts below the neutral mid-points of 4. However, these few trends are not incompatible with the conventional stereotype of the aged and are all concentrated and probably contribute to two of the five factors, viz. those labelled Leadership Fortitude and Conservatism.

FACTOR I

VARIABLE NAME	GROUP MEAN	S.D.	FEMALE MEAN	S.D.	MALE MEAN	S.D.
kind, gentle	5.28	1.15	5.28	1.12	5.28	1.17
truthful, honorable	5.47	1.14	5.52	1.09	5.41	1.19
well-mannered, lovely people	5.07	1.16	5.08	1.10	5.05	1.22
agreeable, understanding	4.54	1.23	4.59	1.24	4.48	1.23
mature, adjusted	5.30	1.19	5.32	1.12	5.28	1.27
controlled, disciplined	5.33	1.17	5.26	1.22	5.39	1.11
sacrificing, giving	5.07	1.23	5.09	1.24	5.05	1.24
possess dignity, self-respect	5.34	1.19	5.31	1.17	5.36	1.22
harmless, wholesome	5.24	1.13	5.32	1.11	5.16	1.15
modesty, humility	4.65	1.12	4.67	1.12	4.64	1.13
sane, sensible	5.07	1.18	5.05	1.23	5.08	1.14
sociable, friendly	5.31	1.39	5.30	1.41	5.32	1.36
generous, altruistic	4.57	1.30	4.50	1.32	4.64	1.27
cheerful, optimistic	4.36	1.27	4.34	1.27	4.38	1.27
serene, relaxed	4.63	1.15	4.65	1.11	4.61	1.20
stable, well-balanced	4.74	1.17	4.81	1.12	4.67	1.23

FACTOR II

VARIABLE NAME	GROUP MEAN	S.D.	FEMALE MEAN	S.D.	MALE MEAN	S.D.
unhealthy, weak	3.93	1.24	3.96	1.17	3.90	1.30
weak, delicate	3.70	1.34	3.74	1.38	3.66	1.29
involved, participating	4.00	1.46	4.11	1.50	3.87	1.41
energetic, active	4.01	1.38	4.04	1.37	3.98	1.39
determined, ambitious	4.41	1.27	4.37	1.26	4.44	1.29
assertive, aggressive	4.17	1.33	4.14	1.33	4.19	1.34
enthusiastic, zestful	4.24	1.23	4.31	1.15	4.16	1.32
independent, self-sufficient	4.37	1.39	4.50	1.33	4.24	1.44
tough-minded, self-reliant	4.49	1.34	4.56	1.28	4.43	1.40
contented, happy	4.43	1.23	4.44	1.24	4.43	1.22
unworried, secure	4.11	1.33	4.10	1.32	4.13	1.35
venturesome, uninhibited	4.05	1.19	4.03	1.17	4.06	1.21
poor, powerless	3.93	1.06	3.94	1.04	3.93	1.09
trained, skilled	4.63	1.28	4.55	1.27	4.73	1.29
over-bearing, dominant	4.38	1.14	4.44	1.08	4.32	1.20
endurance, persistence	4.82	1.31	4.87	1.27	4.77	1.35
competent, professional	4.40	1.16	4.42	1.18	4.38	1.15
organized, co-ordinated	4.78	1.19	4.78	1.17	4.78	1.21
confident, reliant	4.67	1.23	4.64	1.25	4.70	1.21

FACTOR III

VARIABLE NAME	GROUP MEAN	S.D.	FEMALE MEAN	S.D.	MALE MEAN	S.D.
delightful, exquisite	4.74	1.11	4.81	1.02	4.65	1.19
enhances, advances	4.77	1.05	4.77	1.04	4.76	1.05
talented, gifted	4.72	1.18	4.83	1.18	4.62	1.17
insightful, intuitive	4.56	1.21	4.70	1.16	4.41	1.26
appreciative, sensitive	5.17	1.22	5.26	1.19	5.07	1.25
industrious, productive	4.59	1.16	4.71	1.15	4.46	1.17
clean, well-groomed	5.02	1.27	5.07	1.22	4.97	1.33
humorous, witty	4.85	1.22	4.86	1.17	4.83	1.27
creative, imaginative	4.43	1.26	4.57	1.20	4.28	1.31
intelligent, bright	4.88	1.06	4.95	1.03	4.81	1.09
charming, pleasing	4.47	1.20	4.51	1.13	4.42	1.27
idealistic, high-minded	4.30	1.07	4.33	1.01	4.26	1.13
educated, learned	4.70	1.25	4.74	1.12	4.65	1.38
fragrant, aromatic	4.60	1.10	4.59	1.17	4.60	1.03
quiet, placid	4.72	1.23	4.76	1.17	4.69	1.28
courageous, brave	4.38	1.12	4.39	1.08	4.37	1.16
frank, forthright	4.83	1.31	4.84	1.36	4.82	1.26

FACTOR IV

VARIABLE NAME	GROUP MEAN	S.D.	FEMALE MEAN	S.D.	MALE MEAN	S.D.
reliable, responsible	5.29	1.24	5.35	1.12	5.22	1.35
restrained, temperate	4.73	1.21	4.64	1.22	4.82	1.20
co-operative, helpful	5.12	1.27	5.19	1.16	5.05	1.37
conscientious, scrupulous	5.03	1.17	5.10	1.19	4.96	1.15
careful, cautious	5.58	1.10	5.62	1.06	5.53	1.14
methodical, efficient	4.69	1.26	4.79	1.24	4.59	1.28
honest, trustworthy	5.44	1.24	5.51	1.12	5.37	1.37
self-depreciating, modest	4.29	1.30	4.17	1.28	4.41	1.30

FACTOR $\overline{V}$

VARIABLE NAME	GROUP MEAN	S.D.	FEMALE MEAN	S.D.	MALE MEAN	S.D.
rigid, stubborn	3.37	1.41	3.27	1.44	3.48	1.37
conservative, traditional	5.56	1.26	5.58	1.31	5.55	1.21
patient, tolerant	4.45	1.45	4.34	1.45	4.55	1.44
clannish, narrow-minded	4.47	1.40	4.53	1.42	4.40	1.37
trusting, adaptable	4.37	1.37	4.30	1.30	4.43	1.43
frigid, under-sexed	3.56	1.05	3.64	0.99	3.47	1.10
gossipy, mouthy	3.95	1.41	3.90	1.38	4.00	1.45
subjective, personal	3.50	1.28	3.47	1.29	3.52	1.27
habituated, addicted	4.60	1.40	4.56	1.45	4.64	1.34

However, the broader impression from other ratings of 5 or higher seem to reflect and recognize the greater humanity, understanding, sensitivity, experience, willingness to contribute and persistence in the attainment of worthwhile objectives on the part of the older person - a not always expected but perhaps essentially merited description of the older person in our society. If this attitude can be carried over or implemented in policies oriented toward the care of the older person it bodes well for the future and hopefully not only for the older resident in B.C. from whence these data are drawn.

From these results the impression is gained that when older people are rated on a large pattern of trait labels the ratings made by the young reflect that they view the older person neutrally on many traits but better than average (over 4.5) on some 30 traits and somewhat, but by no means largely negatively (below 3.5) on only 2 or 3 traits. Thus, when an opportunity is given to rate the elderly more completely as a total person the positive attributes are less likely to be overlooked than when he is rated on a small number of usually pre-selected traits which have tended to focus more upon the natural failings of the elderly than on the many other positive attributes which are needed to describe them as complete people. For us this implies that we must be vigilant about the particular criteria, purposes, etc., that guide and go into the study of the aged, and this probably justifies the caution and care that has been taken in the preparation of our own rating scales (13), (14), (15).

A similar criticism may be directed to the attitude research which largely features the negative deteriorative impressions gained about the elderly made by various professional groups including clergymen, physicians, dentists, social workers, nurses and physical therapists (16), (17), (18), (19), (20), (21), (22). Such material raises the question as to whether or not the professionals have become oversensitized to a functional negative image based on a narrow range of knowledge gained from treatment situations. And furthermore this image probably does not exist in the usually implied magnitude and may also not represent the true attitudes of the professional toward the larger population of the elderly functioning in normal and healthy situational contexts.

Some interesting observations can be made between the attitude factors extracted for older persons 65 years or older in the present study and those from a study of various groups of socially disadvantaged persons in a previous study (11).

See Appendix II.

The comparison is worth making because of the essentially similar scale used as well as the comparability of the matched males and female groups making the ratings. However, a methodological difference is indicated in the fact that it was necessary to combine the data for males and females in the present study to arrive at the most consistent pattern of interpretable factors, whereas the data in the previous study yielded a similar pattern of 5 clearly interpretable factors for male and female data separately. Another methodological difference that probably influences the findings lies in the fact that each rating subject in the study of the disadvantaged rated all eight groups (randomized for raters to avoid position effects) and the data for all eight groups are combined in the separate male and female analyses. The factors extracted for the socially disadvantaged populations from both the male and female analyses are by order of variance %.: I Appearance, II Sincerity, III Ability, IV Outspokenness, V Fortitude and VI Security. (In the female data Factors IV and V are reversed).

The difference between the 2 sets of factors suggests that possibly people do use different dimensional criteria for evaluating natural misfortunes created by aging than other forms of natural or social misfortune where components of personal responsibility may be more clearly evident concomitants.

From both studies it seems evident that the nature of the target groups being rated do in fact play a part in determining the quality and nature of the factors that are likely to be extracted. From these results it does not seem that people 'carry around' one fixed set of stereotypical dimensions for evaluating all (groups of) people. Rather the nature and qualities of the person(s) being evaluated play a role in determining what the dimensions are likely to be. Thus, for example 'conservatism' emerges as a useful dimension for rating older people but does not emerge as a factor for rating other groups even though the opportunities for its emergence are equivalent.

Would a target group of oldsters over 80-85 elicit attitude dimensions that more closely relate to those of the socially disadvantaged groups?

Appendix I

Code No. ____ ____ Sex: M __ F __ Age: ____ ____ Education: ____ ____
check ✓ years months (Total no. of years)

INSTRUCTIONS: check (✓) the position in each scale that most closely represents what you believe about _____. If you cannot decide check a neutral point in the middle of the scale. 1 = low, 7 = high amount of Trait.

	Ratings	
frigid, under-sexed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	promiscuous, over-sexed
enthusiastic, zestful	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	despairing, hopeless
unhabituated, unaddicted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	habituated, addicted
assertive, aggressive	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unassertive, unaggressive
incompetent, quacky	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	competent, professional
conservative, traditional	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	liberal, radical
weak, delicate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	strong, vigorous
energetic, active	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	lethargic, passive
unreliable, irresponsible	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	reliable, responsible
controlled, disciplined	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	impulsive, undisciplined
over-indulgent, intemperate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	restrained, temperate
careful, cautious	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	careless, heedless
unconfident, unreliant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	confident, reliant
sociable, friendly	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unsociable, isolated
unco-operative, unhelpful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	co-operative, helpful
sacrificing, giving	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	greedy, grasping
suspicious, untrusting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	trusting, adaptable
over-bearing, dominant	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	subservient, submissive
bragging, boastful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	self-depreciating, modest
mature, adjusted	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	immature, maladjusted
gossipy, mouthy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	reticent, discreet
frank, forthright	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	shrewd, calculating
cowardly, faint-hearted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	courageous, brave
kind, gentle	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	mean, hard
conscienceless, unscrupulous	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	conscientious, scrupulous
truthful, honorable	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	lying, deceitful
dishonest, untrustworthy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	honest, trustworthy
sane, sensible	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	foolish, silly
dependent, helpless	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	independent, self-sufficient
flexible, persuasible	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	rigid, stubborn
unstable, unbalanced	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	stable, well-balanced

	Ratings	
modesty, humility	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	vanity, conceit
selfish, self-centered	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	generous, altruistic
cheerful, optimistic	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	cynical, pessimistic
lonely, withdrawn	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	involved, participating
possess dignity, self respect	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	lacking dignity, self respect
dirty, sloppy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	clean, well-groomed
fragrant, aromatic	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	stinky, smelly
noisy, loud	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	quiet, placid
healthy, strong	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unhealthy, weak
disgusting, disappointing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	delightful, exquisite
harmless, wholesome	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dangerous, detrimental
cheapens, corrupts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	enhances, advances
rich, influential	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	poor, powerless
lazy, unproductive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	industrious, productive
contented, happy	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dissatisfied, unhappy
worried, insecure	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	unworried, secure
serene, relaxed	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	frustrated, tense
timid, shy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	venturesome, uninhibited
agreeable, understanding	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	disagreeable, argumentative
irritating, annoying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	charming, pleasing
well-mannered, lovely people	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	bad-mannered, boorish
disorderly, inefficient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	methodical, efficient
organized, co-ordinated	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	disorganized, unco-ordinated
intolerant, impatient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	patient, tolerant
intelligent, bright	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dumb, stupid
artless, deficient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	talented, gifted
educated, learned	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	illiterate, unschooled
unappreciative, insensitive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	appreciative, sensitive
trained, skilled	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	untrained, unskilled
mediocre, low-browed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	idealistic, high-minded
humorous, witty	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dull, monotonous
obtuse, blind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	insightful, intuitive
creative, imaginative	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unoriginal, unimaginative
universal, broad-minded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	clannish, narrow-minded
tough-minded, self-reliant	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	tender-minded, over-protected
subjective, personal	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	objective, impartial
determined, ambitious	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	aimless, purposeless
quitting, fickle	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	endurance, persistence

Alternate form
Appendix I

Code No. _____ Sex: M __ F __ Age: ____ ____ Education: _____
check ✓ years months (Total no. of years)

INSTRUCTIONS: check (✓) the position in each scale that most closely represents what you believe about _____ _____. If you cannot decide check a neutral point in the middle of the scale. 1 = low, 7 = high amount of Trait.

	Ratings	
unstable, unbalanced	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	stable, well-balanced
flexible, persuasible	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	rigid, stubborn
dependent, helpless	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	independent, self-sufficient
sane, sensible	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	foolish, silly
dishonest, untrustworthy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	honest, trustworthy
truthful, honorable	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	lying, deceitful
conscienceless, unscrupulous	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	conscientious, scrupulous
kind, gentle	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	mean, hard
cowardly, faint-hearted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	courageous, brave
frank, forthright	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	shrewd, calculating
gossipy, mouthy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	reticent, discreet
mature, adjusted	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	immature, maladjusted
bragging, boastful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	self-depreciating, modest
over-bearing, dominant	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	subservient, submissive
suspicious, untrusting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	trusting, adaptable
sacrificing, giving	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	greedy, grasping
unco-operative, unhelpful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	co-operative, helpful
sociable, friendly	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unsociable, isolated
unconfident, unreliant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	confident, reliant
careful, cautious	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	careless, heedless
over-indulgent, intemperate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	restrained, temperate
controlled, disciplined	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	impulsive, undisciplined
unreliable, irresponsible	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	reliable, responsible
energetic, active	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	lethargic, passive
weak, delicate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	strong, vigorous
conservative, traditional	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	liberal, radical
incompetent, quacky	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	competent, professional
assertive, aggressive	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unassertive, unaggressive
unhabituated, unaddicted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	habituated, addicted
enthusiastic, zestful	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	despairing, hopeless
frigid, under-sexed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	promiscuous, over-sexed

	Ratings	
quitting, fickle	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	endurance, persistence
determined, ambitious	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	aimless, purposeless
subjective, personal	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	objective, impartial
tough-minded, self-reliant	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	tender-minded, over-protected
universal, broad-minded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	clannish, narrow-minded
creative, imaginative	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unoriginal, unimaginative
obtuse, blind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	insightful, intuitive
humorous, witty	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dull, monotonous
mediocre, low-browed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	idealistic, high-minded
trained, skilled	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	untrained, unskilled
unappreciative, insensitive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	appreciative, sensitive
educated, learned	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	illiterate, unschooled
artless, deficient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	talented, gifted
intelligent, bright	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dumb, stupid
intolerant, impatient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	patient, tolerant
organized, co-ordinated	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	disorganized, unco-ordinated
disorderly, inefficient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	methodical, efficient
well-mannered, lovely people	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	bad-mannered, boorish
irritating, annoying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	charming, pleasing
agreeable, understanding	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	disagreeable, argumentative
timid, shy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	venturesome, uninhibited
serene, relaxed	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	frustrated, tense
worried, insecure	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	unworried, secure
contented, happy	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dissatisfied, unhappy
lazy, unproductive	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	industrious, productive
rich, influential	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	poor, powerless
cheapens, corrupts	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	enhances, advances
harmless, wholesome	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	dangerous, detrimental
disgusting, disappointing	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	delightful, exquisite
healthy, strong	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	unhealthy, weak
noisy, loud	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	quiet, placid
fragrant, aromatic	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	stinky, smelly
dirty, sloppy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	clean, well-groomed
possesses dignity, self respect	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	lacking dignity, self respect
lonely, withdrawn	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	involved, participating
cheerful, optimistic	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	cynical, pessimistic
selfish, self-centered	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	generous, altruistic
modesty, humility	7 6 5 4 3 2 1	vanity, conceit

TABLE 1

Rotated Six Factor Solution of the Social Image Ratings of Eight Groups[1]

	I		II		III	
Factor Name	Appearance		Sincereity		Ability	
MALES						
Eigenvalue	23.72		5.08		2.64	
Cumulative Var.	.35		.43		.47	
% Total Var.	35.41		7.58		3.95	
Factor Content	fragrant	84	tender	67	creative	73
	neat	83	truthful	64	intelligent	71
	sanitary	78	generous	61	talented	68
	industrious	77	honest	61	idealistic	66
	delightful	72	trusting	56	humorous	66
	mannered	70	sociable	54	sensitive	63
	enhances	70	frank	53	insightful	63
	pleasing	66	conscientious	53	educated	58
FEMALES						
Eigenvalue	24.67		5.82		2.75	
Cumulative Var.	.37		.46		.50	
% Total Var.	36.82		8.68		4.11	
Factor Content	neat	85	tender	68	creative	78
	fragrant	82	truthful	66	talented	73
	industrious	80	honest	62	intelligent	70
	sanitary	79	trusting	61	sensitive	69
	reliable	74	sociable	59	idealistic	69
	delightful	72	generous	57	humorous	63
	accomplished	71	conscientious	56	insightful	63
	enhances	71	frank	56	educated	59

[1]The 8 highest loading variables on each factor are listed. Decimals are omitted. Where 8 are not listed, there are no other high loading variables.

[2]In the data for females this factor emerged as Factor V.

TABLE 1 (continued)

IV		V		VI	
Outspokenness		Fortitude		Security	
		MALES			
2.36		1.44		1.10	
.50		.52		.54	
3.37		2.14		1.65	
bragging	62	strong	65	unworried	69
vain	61	independent	58	contented	64
gossipy	60	courageous	51	serene	60
inquisitive	56	endurance	47		
assertive	52	confident	44		
overbearing	51	careful	40		
		FEMALES			
1.79[2]		2.00		1.23	
.55		.53		.57	
2.67		2.98		1.84	
vain	64	strong	61	unworried	74
bragging	60	courageous	56	contented	71
overbearing	55	independent	56	serene	65
inquisitive	54				
gossipy	54				
assertive	54				

TABLE 2

The Mean Factor Scores for the Eight Groups Rated by Males and Females: Results of Multiple Range Test* Included in Parentheses

Factors	I Appearance	II Sincerity	III Ability
Groups	MALES		
Average Adults	.90	.01 (2,3)	.06 (2, 3)
Women	1.20	.34 (1,4)	.51
Mental Retardates	- .12 (1)	.50 (4)	-1.25
Ex-Mental patients	.29	- .13 (3)	.09 (1, 3)
Ex-Criminals	- .08 (1)	-1.17	- .13 (1)
Hippies	-1.39	.23 (1)	.90
Blacks	- .19 (1)	.19 (1, 2)	.13 (2)
N.A. Indians	- .62	.02 (3, 2)	-.15 (1)
	FEMALES		
Average Adults	1.08 (1)	.08 (1)	.09 (2, 3)
Women	1.00 (1)	.41	.48
Mental Retardates	-.26	.69	-1.35
Ex-Mental patients	.22	.19	- .06 (1, 2)
Ex-criminals	.03	-1.18	- .27
Hippies	-1.39	.02 (1)	1.02
Blacks	- .12	.16 (1)	.17 (3)
N.A. Indians	- .56	.01 (1)	-.08 (1)

* The numbers in parentheses following the mean factor scores show the results of a Duncan Multiple Range Test (Halm, 1971; Steel and Torrie, 1960). For example, in the first column of the male ratings, Mental Retardates, Ex-Criminals and Blacks have homogenous means on Factor 1. The other means are significantly different at the .01 level. Similarly on Factor II for Males: Women, Hippies and Blacks (1); Average Adults, Blacks and N.A. Indians (2); Average Adults, Ex-Mental Patients and N.A. Indians (3); and Women and Mental Retardates (4) have homogenous means. Ex-Criminals have scored differently than all of the other groups at the .01 level. In addition any two group means not followed by the same number in parenthese are significantly different.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

IV Outspokenness	V Fortitude	VI Security
	MALES	
.13 (1)	.75	.30 (1)
.70	-.79	.23 (1)
-.24	-.58	.21 (1, 3)
-.57 (2)	-.29 (1)	-.35 (2)
.11 (1)	.53 (2)	-.34 (2)
.39	-.25 (1)	.31 (1)
.18 (1)	.59 (2)	-.39 (2)
-.71 (2)	.04	.02 (3)
	FEMALES	
.29 (1, 2)	.56 (1)	.26 (1)
.48 (2)	-.86	.26 (1)
-.14	-.50 (2)	.40 (1)
-.58	-.57 (2)	-.51 (2)
.20 (1)	.58 (1)	-.43 (2)
.36 (1, 2)	-.06	.36 (1)
.18 (1)	.56 (1)	-.40 (2)
-.79	.29	.05

References

(1) Signori, E.I., and Kozak, J.F. Attitudes of older persons toward aging and the aged. Paper presented at the Educational Meeting of the Canadian Association on Gerontology, November 11-13, 1976.

(2) Kozak, J.F., and Signori, E.I. Cross-cultural observations on aging. Paper presented at the Educational Meeting of the Canadian Association on Gerontology, November 11-13, 1976.

(3) Naus, Peter J. Some correlates of attitudes towards old people. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 1973, Vol. 4, no. 3, 229-243.

(4) Kastenbaum, Robert (ed) New Thoughts on Old Age. Springer Publishing Company, Inc., New York, 1969.

(5) Calhoun, M.K., and Gottesman, L.E. Stereotypes of old age in two samples. Division of Gerontology, U. of Michigan. In R. Kastenbaum's (ed.) New Thoughts on Old Age, 1969, Chapter 18, 237-249.

(6) Weinberger, L.E., and Milham, J. A multi-dimensional, multiple method analysis of attitudes toward the elderly. Journal of Gerontology, 1975, Vol. 30, no. 3, 343-348.

(7) Seltzer, Mildred M., and Atchley, Robert C. The concept of old: Changing attitudes and sterotypes. The Gerontologist, 1971, Vol. II, no. 3, 226-230.

(8) Ivester, Connie, and King, Karl. Attitudes of adolescents toward the aged. The Gerontologist, 1977, Vol. 17, no. 1, 85-89.

(9) Thorson, J.A., Whatley, L., and Hancock, K. Attitudes toward the aged as a function of age and education. The Gerontologist, 1974, vol. 14, no. 4, 316-318.

(10) Signori, E.I., Sampson, L.G., and Rempel, H. Trait labels for rating socially disadvantaged groups on employment. Psychological Reports, 1968, Vol. 23, 160-162.

(11) Butt-Finn, S., and Signori, E.I. The social image of disadvantaged groups. Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 1976, Vol. 4, no. 2.

(12) Halm, Jason. Factor Analysis. Computer programme provided by the University of British Columbia Computing Centre, revised July 1976.

(13) Kilty, Keith M., and Feld, Allen. Attitudes toward aging and toward the needs of older people. Journal of Gerontology, 1976, Vol. 31, no. 5, 586-594.

(14) Drevenstedt, Jean. Scale-checking styles on the semantic differential among older people. Journal of Gerontology, 1975, Vol. 30, no. 2, 170-173.

(15)Bruker, T.H., and Powers, E.A. The sterotypes of "old": A review and alternative approach. Journal of Gerontology, 1976, Vol. 31, 441-447.

(16)Moberg, Richard G. The attitudes of ministers toward old people. Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 30 (6-A), 2619.

(17)Longino, Charles F., and Kitson, Gay C. Parish clergy and the aged: Examining stereotypes. Journal of Gerontology, 1976, Vol. 31, no. 3, 340-345.

(18)Cicchetti, D.V., Fletcher, C.R., Lerner, E., and Coleman, J.V. Effects of a social medicine course on the attitudes of medical students toward the elderly: A controlled study. Journal of Gerontology, 1973, Vol. 28, no. 3, 370-373.

(19)Brown, M.I. Attitudes of nursing personnel toward aged patients. The Gerontologist. Program of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Gerontological Society, 1966, Vol. 6, no. 3 (Par 2), 19.

(20)Hickey, T., Rakowski, W., Hultsch, D.F., and Fatula, B.J. Attitudes toward aging as a function of in-service training and practitioner age. Journal of Gerontology, 1976, Vol. 31, no. 6, 681-686.

(21)Tuckman, J., and Lorge, I. Attitudes toward old people. Journal of Gerontology, 1975, Vol. 30, no. 3, 343-348.

(22)Coe, Rodney M. Professional perspectives on the aged. The Gerontologist, 1967, Vol. 7, no. 2 (part 1), 114-119.

(23)Cattell, R.B. The Sixteen Personality-Factor Questionnaire (Rev. ed.) IPAT, Champaign, Illinois (1957b)